LAY SERMONS

BY

AMOS GRISWOLD WARNER

NOTES SUPPLEMENTARY
TO THE
JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY STUDIES
IN
HISTORICAL AND POLITICAL SCIENCE

LAY SERMONS

BY

AMOS GRISWOLD WARNER

WITH A

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

BY

GEORGE ELLIOTT HOWARD

BALTIMORE
THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
1904

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Editorial Note	6
Biographical, by George Elliott Howard	7
Preface. By Amos Griswold Warner	11
I. In Default of Demonstration	13
II. The Triumph of Evil	25
III. When Changes Come	39
IV. Vicarious Sacrifice	53
Bibliography	67

EDITORIAL NOTE

The author of the addresses here printed was a student and afterward a lecturer in the Johns Hopkins University. In Baltimore he began also the official career which led to his recognition as an authority upon scientific charity. It is fitting, therefore, that the publications of the department in which his advanced studies began, should contain a brief memorial of an honored friend and contributor.

Professor Howard's biographical sketch was delivered at a memorial meeting held at Stanford University, January 23, 1900. The addresses of Professor Warner were delivered before the Chapel Union of the same University in the autumn of 1897. The preface was written by his own hand in December of that year.

LAY SERMONS BY AMOS GRISWOLD WARNER.

BIOGRAPHICAL.

By Professor George Elliott Howard.

Just twenty years ago last September there appeared for registration at the University of Nebraska a farmer boy from Roca, a small village some eleven miles away. His raiment was of the severest country type. His eye shone with the humane and quizzical light so familiar to his friends, as he looked out expectantly upon the new world which he was about to enter and of which in more than usual measure he was destined to take possession. It was soon perceived by us all, as we learned more and more to appreciate his power, that a rare mind had come amongst us. The young student threw himself heart and brain into all the larger and nobler activities which make up the modern academic life. He found himself citizen of a democratic society—a microcosm of the larger world beyond—in which he might enjoy the rights and privileges of a full franchise. He soon became a leader in student affairs—a pioneer in the upbuilding of collegiate institutions. Very important for him is the part which a youth takes in the making of the institutions which form the academic life. As he is strong or weak in that life, so is he likely to be in the future civic life. In many ways Warner made his influence felt, and always, in a wholesome way, on the institutional growth of the university. In debate, on the college press, in the daily routine of the class-room, he bore his part ably and modestly as became the born leader of men.

Warner had a delicate sense of humor which has seldom been equalled. In later years it gave a pungent flavor to

his speech and writing. In his student days it made him a leader in college fun—in true college fun; that kind which gives expression to the joy and good-will of a manly but gentle soul never unmindful of the rights or the feelings of others. He was not found among those who in the name of a college joke delight in tormenting persons mentally or physically weaker than themselves; nor among those whose only claim to academic distinction is the wearing of good clothes; or those who seek a reputation for "manliness" by venturing on forbidden paths.

In another way Warner's originality and strength of character were disclosed. It was not his early purpose to enter one of the so-called "higher" professions. He told me that he had resolved to graduate and then to carry the culture he had gained into a farmer's life. Only in his senior year, apparently, was this purpose given up. He then became deeply interested in historical studies. The influence which definitively fixed his growing inclination to prepare himself for a scientific course came to him through a piece of research work done in connection with a course of study in the history of the French Revolution. His thesis on the cause of the Jacobin Conquest eventually led him to Johns Hopkins University, where he was very soon honored with a fellowship.

While still a graduate student, Warner received his first call to public duty. The patron of charities in Baltimore heard him speak, and invited him to become the general agent for the Charity Organization of that city. The plough-boy of Roca undertook this extremely difficult social service for the southern metropolis, and he discharged his task with conspicuous success. In this work he continued until 1889—the year after taking the Ph. D. degree. Then came his first call to teach. In September, 1889, as associate professor, he was placed in charge of the department of economics in the University of Nebraska. During the few months that he held this chair he gave abundant evidence of his originality of mind and of his extraordinary

power as a teacher. He developed his course in the scientific study of industrial corporations—the first ever offered in an American university; and with myself as his colleague he coöperated in organizing a joint seminary of history and political science, the first seminary founded in the University of Nebraska.

Next came his second and most important call to public duty. In 1891 he was selected by President Harrison to become the first Superintendent of Charities for the Disrict of Columbia under the act which Congress had recently passed. It was a post demanding hard work, signal ability, and rare tact in the management of men. It must here suffice to say that the suggestions regarding the details of organization and the appropriations of money submitted in his special reports were adopted and put in force by Congress; and a model system of organized charities was thus created for the national capital.

His second call to teach came from Stanford University in 1893. While serving the government in Washington he told me that he had decided not to take up professional work again. The influence which changed his mind and determined his coming to Stanford was the gift of the Hopkins Railway Library. Warner was deeply interested in railroad problems, as he was in all questions connected with industrial corporations, and now he saw an opportunity for a new institution, a railway school of unique character, one whose curriculum should comprehend, not merely financial and economic problems, but practical courses in administration and engineering as well. Had his life been spared, probably in due time this ideal would have been realized, and so Stanford University would have had in history the distinction of founding the first railway school.

But this was not to be. Doubtless, like every scholar who has devoted his life to the service of his fellow-men, Warner must have deeply regretted the leaving of his work unfinished. But *was* his work left unfinished? How full of noble deeds were his few years! I know of no more inspir-

ing lesson than that afforded by the brief career of Amos Griswold Warner. Behold the country lad as he swiftly rises to the highest academic honors! See him as with master hand he skilfully grapples with the hard social problems of two great cities! In his *American Charities*, a book already honored as a "classic," he laid the foundations of a science, while in his course on Industrial Corporations he organized an important branch of another. But there is something more precious than all these things: the influence for social righteousness ever reflected from his pure heart and lofty mind. One may compare it in its results to a diamond cast into the water. The circling waves of moral and intellectual influence recede and spread away until they break on the uttermost shores of time.

PREFACE.

These sermons were addressed primarily to students, and especially, perhaps, to students interested in scientific subjects and scientific methods. The hearers were of various religious faiths, and included a considerable number of persons having no formal theological convictions whatever. In view of this fact, and of the further one that the speaker was a layman, it seemed expedient to limit the view strictly to this world, and to forces which are apprehensible without any assumption of special revelation. The message sought to be conveyed is therefore limited, but may nevertheless have an importance and a sanction of its own. If it is found that some theology does, in fact, underlie the sermons, it is presumably that of John Greenleaf Whittier.

The purpose of the course was to derive a religious impulse from the subject matter of scientific study, to preach from facts instead of Scripture, to deduce a plea for the lifted heart from the dusty things of life and experience which it was the week-day business of the hearer to sort and study, and with which all intelligent persons both in and out of college are familiar. This indicates that while the sermons are from social science they are not of it. Nothing could have been less called for than to impose an additional scientific lecture upon the Sunday congregation of students, unless it had been to sermonize to classes during the week. The distinction between the two kinds of work is further elaborated in the first sermon, which was planned as an introduction to the series, and an explanation of it.

LAY SERMONS BY AMOS GRISWOLD WARNER.

I.

IN DEFAULT OF DEMONSTRATION.

Many sermons were preached during the last presidential campaign from the text, "Thou shalt not steal." It is a good text and we are all better for hearing a good sermon from it occasionally, but it was dreadfully abused in the campaign referred to. Some sermons ran thus: "'Thou shalt not steal;' therefore vote for the free coinage of silver." This kind were heard very commonly in Colorado. Others ran thus: "'Thou shalt not steal;' therefore vote against the free coinage of silver." This kind were heard very commonly in the creditor States of the East. The whole nation was yelling "Stop, thief!" but no one could conclusively show who was the real thief. It was the business of one of the social sciences known as economics to make clear the exact influence of the proposed policy and so to demonstrate which side was about to violate the eighth commandment. But the laws formulated by science were almost as silent in the clash of parties as the Roman laws were said to be in the clash of arms. Why was this? Was it because the American people, including their leaders, were wilfully blind? Did the people of both parties or of either party prefer darkness rather than light because their impulses and ambitions were evil? Hardly so. People were in the dark because science had not shed light enough on the problem to enable them to see their way clearly.

"The scientist," as has been said by one of my colleagues, "is essentially a see-er," a man whose business it is to see things in their right relations, and to demonstrate the correctness of his seeing for the benefit of others. "He links phenomena to phenomena and reveals their causes." The

silver problem was too complicated for him to solve by scientific methods. Many minor points concerning it he could elucidate, much he could say upon it which no rational and candid man could dispute; he could trace many relatively safe paths through the jungles amid the pitfalls where untrained persons got lost; but on the general issue, real and complete demonstration was beyond him.

That demonstration could not be reached is shown by the fact that good authorities were to be found on each side. Some able economists took one view of the matter, others emphatically championed an opposite view, and even among those that agreed as to conclusions there were seldom two that agreed as to the methods of reaching their conclusions. You may urge that more students of economics or, in your judgment, better ones were on one side than on the other of the silver question, but the reply is that demonstration is not a matter of averaging and balancing opinions. Let us bring to mind the essential character of a demonstration by an anecdote from a funny paper:

"First Lawyer: 'I was looking over my boy's geometry lesson last night. I was quite interested in the proposition that the three interior angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles.' Second Lawyer: 'That is not very complicated.' First Lawyer: 'No; but I was trying to think what a man could do if he had the other side of the case.'"

Now law, in so far as it is scientific, is one of the social sciences. A man trained in that specialty had grown so fully into the belief that there are two sides to every question that he was trying to find arguments to controvert a mathematical demonstration. Whenever there really are two sides to a question demonstration has not as yet been reached, science has not as yet pronounced its final word in regard to it.

In the social sciences formal demonstration is usually out of the question. We deal not with axioms and demonstrations, but with a calculus of relative probabilities. "What a mush," you exclaim, "these sciences must be! How in-

tellectually demoralizing to study them! How serviceless they must be when studied!" Before you leap to such conclusions let us see what guidance in practical affairs is to be obtained from other and simpler sciences, from sciences that stand nearer to the material universe.

A chronic invalid was cross-questioning his doctor as to the best course for the succeeding year. Where should he go, what work should he try to do, and so on. The doctor indicated a number of things which it would certainly not be wise to do, but when pressed to say what was the best thing to be done, answered boldly, "There is absolutely no way of telling what is wisest for you to do." This was a franker answer than many doctors would have been willing to give, and yet it was the right one. Here was a little problem which one would have supposed might have been given a final solution. It seemed to be only a question of lung capacity, and blood analysis, and so forth on one side, and on the other of climatic conditions. And yet after microscopy and bacteriology and laryngology and climatology had all been consulted a conclusion was reached which seemed "most lame and impotent."

Before the shafts have been sunk or the tunnels run ask science if there is gold in paying quantities in the hills that look down on Cripple Creek, Colorado. It is the business of science to see. Can she see into a rock beyond the drill point? To some extent she can, but she has to be modest in giving her answers to such practical questions or she is likely to be mistaken. In the case of Cripple Creek she did not know, and "experts" who undertook to talk positively in her name made mistakes.

But when demonstration fails as a guide to conduct, when the conclusions of science are lame and impotent, does it follow that we whose duty it is to act must also be lame and impotent? Must the professor who cannot see his way completely through the currency problem refrain from voting or from expressing an opinion? Must the judge avoid a decision because there are two sides to every question? Must

the patient sit down and die because the physician cannot indicate a course for him that is certainly best? Must men and money refrain from piercing the hills until geology and mineralogy are perfected sciences? By no means. Formal demonstration plays and can play but a small part in establishing the conclusions upon which conduct is based. We act and must act largely upon instinct, upon probabilities, upon "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." Only children can properly permit themselves to be afraid of the dark. It is the common business of men to go forward into it, carrying as good a lantern of demonstration as may be at the time available, but anyhow going forward. The scientist, the see-er, must stop, the man and the citizen must go ahead.

Hamlet's soliloquy was uttered by a young man just home from the university. He reasoned very perspicuously upon both sides of the question, "Is life worth living?" but he was so occupied with his reasoning that he forgot either to live or to die to much purpose. After the time for action had come he puttered around collecting further proofs to justify action, and finally the drama comes to an end at a pile of corpses, in which is to be found that of the melancholy sophomore himself.

The members of an institution of learning are constantly urged to reason about things, to think things out, to rationalize their lives. The advice is good, but it must be followed none the less guardedly. There is more than one way of blundering. There are two sides to a bridge and the horse that makes a specialty of shying at one of them is likely to go over the other. While the average man may think too little, there are students who, like Hamlet, think too much. If it be urged that Hamlet and these others do not think too much but think wrongly, and to mistaken ends, I shall not quarrel about the form of statement. At least they do thinking that better not be done. They reason about things until they forget to obey instincts that have firmer foundations than their reasoning, and they come to value intellectual

certainty so highly that they are paralyzed in the numberless cases when it is not to be reached. The intellect is such a splendid tool and they have learned to use it so deftly that they forget that there is any work to which it is not suited. It is our present purpose to remind ourselves of some things the intellect is not good for, of certain ways in which this most invaluable tool is abused by over-use.

1. Students commonly make great mental efforts to solve problems that none of the giants of philosophy have heretofore been able to solve. There is no particular harm in this. To rake up all the insoluble problems in philosophy and try to solve them is even a useful form of exercise. It helps in the development of immature intellects as biting on hard rubber helps the baby in the development of immature teeth. The danger is that, like Hamlet, we will take our speculations too seriously, or imagine it necessary to reach intellectual certainty before we do what we instinctively realize to be our duty.

Hamlet's interest in the question, "Is life worth living?" is symptomatic of a state of mind that usually comes rather late in a young man's development. It is preceded by meditation upon fate and free-will, the reality of the material universe, and, if the person is of a mathematical turn of mind, by thoughts on the squaring of the circle, and on the possibility of separating the convex from the concave side of the curve. If one has had religious training the problem of the origin of evil will present itself, and freedom of the will may be set over against foreknowledge and the doctrine of election. Every one whose mind is at all thoughtful, and who has the student's leisure to think would apparently like to be a philosopher. Most of us find it hard work and give it up. I am one of those who have given it up, and yet am not sorry to have tried.

It was some years after I had ceased trying to invent perpetual motion machines that I took up the problem of fate and free-will, and wrestled with it mightily or at least with all the might I had. A college chum had become possessed

of an alleged axiom to the following effect: "A given thing happens because there are more reasons why it should happen than why it should not." With this as a base line he was prepared to run minute surveys of the whole universe, and allot to each individual in severalty his pitiful quarter section of fate. After a long discussion with him in which he had decidedly the better of it, I went home determined to settle the question by one dead-lift effort of the intellect. The conclusion reached was this: My brain is worthless for that kind of work and I will never again waste energy by so employing it. This, like other good resolutions, has not been strictly adhered to, but time and again when I have tried to get work from my intellect for which it was not fitted, relief and comfort have been found by coming back to that old resolve and resting in it.

Because my own reasoning powers made their Russian campaign in the matter of fate and free-will, it does not follow that you would have the same experience. Starting along the path which so many have travelled in vain you may get somewhere. Try it and see. There are better methods for scaling the heights of speculation than the running-high-jump which I attempted. Use some of these and at the end of your work you will know more about yourself and your capacities, even if you have not settled all the points regarding free moral agency. There are only two things to be avoided as essentially mischievous: one is the pretense of certainty when you have not attained it, and the other is blank discouragement because of failure. Dr. Johnson said that "Of course all the arguments are against the freedom of the will, but of course the will is free and that ends the matter." One man of my acquaintance has adopted as his working hypothesis that his own will is free but that all other human beings are automata. This enables him to hold himself responsible for wrong-doing but to find excuses for the wrong-doing of others and he does not let a little thing like logic interfere with what seem to him the practically good results of his astounding assumption. This man

simply has the courage to snub his own intellect when what he feels to be right conduct requires it.

We might go on and raise a long procession of "the questions old and dark." Dr. Arnold, afterwards of Rugby, became deeply involved in the considerations of these everlasting enigmas when he was a young man at the University. He raised such a swarm of difficulties and doubts that his friends said, "We must get him away from the university and the constant temptations to meditation which it affords. Hard work is what he needs. When he is busy he will be all right." And he was. That is the solution of the insoluble which most of us have to accept. Is life worth living? Live and find out. Is the will free? See how large a share of independence you can conquer for yourself? How did evil get into the world? See what you can do to get some of it out. Think, but do not let your life "become sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought." Beware lest the rubber ring on which it was good to bite becomes a file on which it is fatal to gnaw.

2. A second way in which we over-use our intellects is by trying to make them do the work belonging to instincts which might much better be trusted. The man who doubts his mother's love and seeks reassurance in the syllogism will not find it. "You cannot," asserts an evangelistic minister, "get into heaven head-first," and certainly many of the best things of this world cannot be reached by reasoning one's way towards them. Love, friendship, honesty, purity, courage: the man is not fortunate who must seek to enter into these things by ratiocinative processes. We must perforce rationalize large departments of our lives, let us not waste energy in rationalizing departments that can safely be left to the management of spontaneous and healthful instincts.

There is no hard and fast rule here to guide one in deciding what things should and what should not be reasoned about. Some people have healthful instincts and poor reasoning powers. Others have strong reasoning powers and unhealthful instincts. It is commonly believed that women are

especially strong in one of these ways and men in the other. Some men who are naturally healthy try to rationalize their diet and make themselves dyspeptics as a consequence. Others have appetites that are wholly misleading as to their needs for food, and they must rationalize their diet or be sick. The true economy of energy is for each man to find out what of his inborn instincts are trustworthy and then trust them—to permit the growth of very strong prejudices in their favor. Do we not all know of students who think about what they shall eat until they have indigestion? who canvass the kind and quantity of exercise they require until muscular exertion affords no rest for the tired brain? who deliberate on what studies they shall take until one is tempted to consider opportunity for election of studies a mistake and alternative courses a delusion and a snare? who balance so carefully the advantages and drawbacks of friendship that they become incapable of real loyalty to a friend? who know so much about the data of ethics that they can almost be said to have no morals? who speculate so extensively on their relations to their Maker that he altogether ceases to be to them "a very present help in time of trouble?"

Why is it that college graduates have to be trained all over again before they make good business men? Largely because in addition to the technical knowledge they must acquire there is a further need of their learning to rely upon their instincts. The business man learns to judge associates, acquaintances, competitors, applicants for positions, applicants for credit, on very meager information, and after a few words exchanged with them. The searching look, the well-put question, give him his cue, and he follows his instincts without waiting for demonstration. If his instincts are correct he is a successful business man; if not, he goes to the wall. After one who has been a student has had this supplementary training in prompt and decisive action he may make a better business man than if he had never been a student, for he is apt to have learned how to furnish himself with a foundation of exact information which the narrow business

man might never think of collecting. The man who is most likely to come to all he was meant for, is he who can reason both formally and informally; who has the patience to achieve demonstration when it is attainable and the courage to act without it when it is not.

3. In matters of social reform the scholar is too apt to be the obstinate or timorous conservative. Listen to Wendell Phillips as he indicts the educated class for its attitude during the anti-slavery agitation. (He is speaking before the Phi Beta Kappa Society at Harvard, a society especially organized for the promotion of scholarship:)

"The Fremont campaign of 1856 taught Americans more than a hundred colleges; and John Brown's pulpit at Harper's Ferry was equal to ten thousand ordinary chairs. God lifted a million of hearts to his gibbet, as the Roman cross lifted a world to itself in that divine sacrifice of two thousand years ago. As much as statesmanship had taught in our previous eighty years, that one week of intellectual watching and weighing and dividing truth taught twenty millions of people. Yet how little, brothers, can we claim for bookmen in that uprising and growth of 1856? And while the first of American scholars could hardly find in the rich vocabulary of Saxon scorn words enough to express amid the plaudits of his class, his loathing and contempt for John Brown, Europe thrilled to him as proof that our institutions had not lost their native and distinctive life. . . . . The book-men, as a class, have not yet acknowledged him.

"It is here that letters betray their lack of distinctive American character. Fifty millions of men God gives us to mould; burning questions, keen debate, great interests trying to vindicate their right to be, sad wrongs brought to the bar of public judgment—these are the people's schools. Timid scholarship either shrinks from sharing in these agitations, or denounces them as dangerous and vulgar interference by incompetent hands with matters above them. . . .

"That unrivalled scholar, the first and greatest New England ever sent to Congress, signaled his advent by quoting the original Greek of the New Testament in support of slavery, and offering to shoulder his musket in its defense. . . . . Editors omitted pages in republishing English history; even Pierpont emasculated his class-book; Bancroft remodelled his chapters; and Everett carried Washington

through thirty States, remembering to forget the brave words the wise Virginian had left on record warning his countrymen of this evil. Amid this battle of the giants scholarship sat dumb for thirty years until imminent deadly peril convulsed it into action, and colleges, in their despair, gave to the army that help they had refused to the market-place and rostrum."

This indictment of learning by the great radical is only less bitter than the one he knew how to draw from similar premises of religion. It is one-sided, of course, but it is on a side that we do well to consider from time to time. To begin a reply to it one need only think of those three sons of Harvard, Emerson, Lowell and Phillips himself. Instead of replying, however, let us be sure that we understand how much of real truth the indictment contains. Let us remember the corroborative testimony of John Bright when he says that "the trouble with great thinkers is that they usually think wrong," let us see if the fact that the representatives of Oxford and Cambridge in the English Parliament have always been high tories does anything to confirm the blunt assertion that the educated classes are always wrong, let us see if there be any logical reason why the journals of our own country that especially pander to the educated classes have blacklisted so many good men and good causes.

There seem to be two leading reasons why scholarly people are inclined to an ultra and unhealthful conservatism. The first is that their reasoning faculties have often been developed at the expense of their sympathies. In one of Charles Kingsley's fairy stories there is a giant who is described as having a heart, "though it was considerably overgrown with brains." The same malformation is to be observed in many individuals and some periodicals that pride themselves on being scholarly or scientific. A wise reviewer of the career of Gladstone says:

"Poetical sympathies are certainly not infallible in politics, but in great emergencies they are often surer guides than the average conclusions of the intellect. For poetic feeling is a form of truth, and reasons well, though it dispenses with the syllogism."

The second and most important reason why educated people are inclined to be unduly conservative is that they have acquired an undue dependence upon demonstration as a guide to conduct. Now in the social sciences, as we have already insisted, demonstration is usually out of the question. It is never safe to employ the letters "q. e. d." Waiting for demonstration, the careful student of social affairs stands still. Depending on only a part of himself, his intellect, he waits to be absolutely sure he is right before he goes ahead, and so never goes ahead at all.

"Scholarship is likely to become retrospective," says a leading American sociologist, "and so not conservative but obstructive, in proportion to its insistence that nothing belongs to its province except demonstrative evidence. The only things which, to our minds, are absolutely certain are accomplished facts. Scholarship which would guard against becoming speculation and adventure, dreads departure from this sure region of the has-been, for exploration of the somewhat conjectural realm of the more reasonable and possible and desirable which is to be."

Let the scientist busy himself with clear seeing. It is not only his duty to do that but it is equally his duty to stop at that. At the same time let the man and the citizen within and above the scientist remember that it is often his duty to go forward through clouds and mists, that sometimes he should even walk over what seems a precipice, remembering that

> "The steps of Faith
> Fall on the seeming void, and find
> The rock beneath."

The old abolitionists were willing to push the United States into the bottomless pit of civil war, trusting that it would get out somehow and be a better nation. When the smoke and horror to follow the Reformation began to appear on the horizon the highly intellectual Erasmus hesitated and drew back. Martin Luther was irrational enough to throw his ink bottle at the devil and go ahead.

In conclusion, let us not misunderstand one another. Demonstration is a splendid thing when you can get it. It

is worth working for, agonizing for. Science is an incomparable guide in territories that it has really conquered. The extent of territory that it has so conquered is wonderfully vast. Its conquests must continue to increase in geometric ratio with the years. It is the chief business of many of us to promote these conquests. But the territory that science has conquered and surveyed and charted is not all the universe either of mind or matter. We, and countless generations after us, must live on the border line where science is still working, and feeling forward, and making mistakes. On our one hand is the country where science has enabled us to see the way; where roads and bridges have been built, and reliable guide-boards have been put up. But as individuals and as an organized society we shall constantly be obliged to go forward into dark forests, to cross unbridged rivers of unknown depth, and to lose ourselves in the mists and bewilderments of tortuous valleys. In this land of shadow and alarm science will have run only preliminary surveys and many of these will be found inaccurate and sometimes grossly misleading. It is a district where we shall need all our courage, where we shall have use for all our instincts of wood-craft, and where it will often be safer to ignore the guide-boards and to watch the stars.

II.

THE TRIUMPH OF EVIL

Of all the Utopias that have been written but few undertake to set forth what will happen in a society where worst comes to worst. One such book, however, was among the many called into existence by Bellamy's "Looking Backward." In it the author tries to show what this country will be in case the evil influences which he considers to be now operative continue to operate, and to bring forth fruit after their kind.

At the time when Mr. Bellamy places a state socialism that works all but perfectly, this other writer fixes the date of a social cataclysm in which the civilization and nearly all the population of the world is swallowed up. The mechanics of civilization have become perfect. Machinery does everything. But the rich have become excessively rich and thereby powerful, and therefrom selfish. The poor are abjectly poor and therefrom cringing but full of hate; ignorant and powerless, but at heart as lustful and cruel as the rich. The engines of war have been perfected along with the engines of industry and luxury. They include high explosives and armored airships and dreadful poisons. They are deadly beyond all conception, and the military class would rule the world except that its members also are venal and sell themselves to the heartless plutocracy. The Jew dominates the world, and the evil characteristics of the Jew are uppermost. Then comes a world-wide revolution beside which the French Revolution pales its fires and seems peaceful and quiet. It is a contention in which the leaders upon either side are equally selfish and equally brutal, and the success of either party means the extinction of civilization. The motto of the time might be the wild words of Northumberland:

"Let order die
And let the world no longer be a stage
To feed contention in a lingering act;
But let one spirit of the first-born Cain
Reign in all bosoms, that, each heart being set
On bloody courses, the rude scene may end,
And darkness be the burier of the dead!"

The book did not make much of an impression. Cassandra has never been a popular person. While the optimistic utopias are remembered and studied, a book like "Caesar's Column," by the alarmist and populist and finder of cryptograms, Ignatius Donnelley, is pretty well forgotten. When one who portrays the social future dips his brush "in hues of earthquake and eclipse," not many care to look at his picture. Like Daniel Webster, we shrink from contemplating national and social disaster, and echo his words, "God grant that in my day at least that curtain may not rise. God grant that on my vision never may be opened what lies behind."

There is much justification for this. It is better to stretch forward to things that are good than to push ourselves backward away from things that are evil. It is commonly wiser to take exercise than to study pathology. And yet Troy did fall as Cassandra said it would. Empires have rotted down as philosophers said they must. Had Webster lived a little longer he must have

"Felt beneath his feet disunions fierce upthrow.
The late sprung mine that underlaid
His sad concessions, vainly made."

The forces of evil are always active and they sometimes conquer. The ostrich does not escape by hiding its head in the sand. Pathology is not a pleasant study, but it is sometimes necessary to study it.

The new pathology of the medical schools has many suggestions for the student of sociology. There used to be much talk about the *vis medicatrix Naturæ*, the healing power of nature. It was thought that nature had some special liking for man, and would keep him in health if he would let her. It is now known that nature is on both sides of the

battle. She gives man organs and instincts that preserve him at one time and destroy him at another. She prods him forward to a precipice and if he has not skill enough to get down it safely she simply drives on more men till she happens on some who have that skill. More than this, the new pathology has shown that in many cases the forces of disease and of decay are themselves vital, aggressive, backed by nature as much as ourselves. The same Providence that watches the fall of a sparrow may be supposed to watch the insects on which the sparrow feeds, and even the careers of the microscopic organisms that prevent the broken wing of the sparrow from healing. Neither is there any reason why such a Providence should not take a continuous interest in the history of the pathogenic bacterium that lives in the living tissues of a man. Pasteur and others have shown that in the order of nature, to rot is as natural as to live. Disease is not an accident, nor decay a blunder. There is simply a balance of forces, a contention of organisms, a different phase of the much talked about struggle for existence.

In organized society the forces of evil are also vital and aggressive. We have got past the delusion that perfect social health can be had by doing something that used to be called "following nature." The perplexing discovery is made that man is himself a part of nature and when he considers himself to be following her, is often only following his own instincts and prepossessions, doing nothing more progressive than is the kitten that chases its own tail. Thus, warned away from the old search for a cure-all, thrown back upon the truth that offenses must needs come, and yet that it will be woe to those by whom they come, deprived of any infallible guide in social affairs, we are ready to search intelligently for special and different evils, to examine them in detail and to prepare to assail them in their causes.

We have had of late years much time spent in the study of social organisms. History has come to be largely insti-

tutional. Sociology has been born. The mechanism of social and industrial life has been studied as never before, and some have perhaps come to feel that social and industrial salvation is a matter of mechanics, that if we can only invent the proper anatomy for the social body it will have unlimited and unending health. Like the constitution builders of the period of the French Revolution, many are inclined to feel that if only the proper scheme of organization can be hit upon we shall be saved.

It cannot be denied that bad organization is one cause of social ills. There are malformations that bring disease and death, institutions that, like the vermiform appendix, have outlived their usefulness; other institutions that, like the valves in our veins, have never been got into proper shape to serve present needs. Slavery was an institution that once served a relatively good purpose, but any nation that insisted on keeping it after its time was past, suffered dreadful consequences. The French people were once saved by the development of the kingship, and later by its abolition.

There are periods in history during which evil seems to have triumphed primarily because the machines of church and state government had worn out or become antiquated. Consider Germany during the Thirty Years' War. An ancient and wealthy church had been discredited and lost its hold upon the people. An ancient empire awkwardly constructed had lost its power to preserve the peace. Petty states with mutual jealousies and warring sects with anxiety for church revenues reenforcing their desire to cram truth down the throats of their neighbors, wrangled and fought and destroyed each other during the thirty long years. There was within the country itself no power to achieve a worthy peace. The desperate struggle dragged on towards exhaustion, and it was a relative blessing when the land was dominated by a soldier of fortune, subdued by a Swede, and finally pacified by a Frenchman.

The Germans of that time do not seem to have been worse individually than their forefathers or their descendants.

Hideously bad men and women there of course were, and at such times the worst are often the most prominent. But the people were brave, patriotic, at least locally, and obstinately religious. That they had a large endowment of character is proven by the place in Europe and the world occupied by their descendants. They went through infinite distress and were on the verge of annihilation simply from lack of constructive leadership and from the breakdown of the machinery of government.

Read the careful historians of the period in our own history that followed the war of the revolution, and you will conclude that if our forefathers had not had the ingenuity, the patience and the courage to devise a new and more efficient organization than the old Confederation this country would have seen very evil times.

At present we have a government that will probably serve our purposes admirably so long as we can contrive to be admirable individuals. It is not sō clear that we have an industrial organization of which the same can be said. The cramps we call panics, the inflammations we call strikes and lock-outs, the congestions of power we call trusts, the paralysis we call non-employment, and the cancerous growths we call pauperism and crime, probably have part of their origin in systemic causes which no conceivable degree of righteousness on the part of individuals could wholly cure.

The organic evils are more likely to break down the health of the individual than is the health of the individual to work a cure of the organism. Good lumber may be built into a poor house, and the lumber will itself be ruined in the decay or downfall of the structure.

While it may not be right to say with Karl Marx that men make political institutions but industrial institutions make men, yet it must be admitted that there is force in the agitators' claim that the promises of democracy may fail of fulfilment through industrial causes. "Monopolies and the People," "The Railroads and the Republic," "Wealth against Commonwealth" are the titles of some of the books

that indict existing conditions, and seek to show that what our constitutions profess to guarantee industrial forces are taking from us.

Competition when it is finished is apparently to bring forth combination, and revolutions in industry bring dangers as imminent as those that come from revolutions in religion or politics. It is not enough that each of us tries to be good; we must be intelligent and enterprising as well. The machinery of industrial salvation must be invented and put in motion or we shall not be saved. In industrial affairs we stand much where our fathers stood at the close of the Revolutionary War, or where England stood when the factory system became dominant and required regulation. We have achieved great material successes. But we also face great dangers and the responsibility is upon us of inventing ways of preserving the good things that have been won without perishing from the evils that may follow the changes.

When we say that proper machinery must be invented it is not to be understood that it will probably be invented by any one man or at any one time. It will come rather like the constitution of the United States from the anxious thinking, from the life-long study and self-devotion of a large number of patriots. This is not the place or the time to discuss what the new machinery will be like. It will be the duty of many people to help find the new industrial methods and help to get them adopted. Those to whom the duty comes must in no wise shirk. Next Sunday it will be our special purpose to consider the spirit in which the duties indicated should be approached.

The strong drift of present study is liable, however, to cause us to over-emphasize the mechanical causes of the triumph of evil. Such causes there are but they are not the most fundamental ones, and others are well deserving of serious consideration. Especially is this true in the domain of politics or government. If it be true, as we have half implied, that the chief present need in industry is better

organization, it is still more emphatically true that the chief present need on the political side of our collective living is better individuals. The problem on the political side of life is for the individuals comprising the people to be brave enough and intelligent enough and self-sacrificing enough so that they can live together under a representative form of government. If we emphasize machinery in discussing modern industry we must emphasize character in discussing modern politics.

There was a time when citizens of this "our great and glorious republic" were very sure that their form of government made the triumph of evil impossible. That the one thing socially needful was universal manhood suffrage, that the declaration of independence and the preamble of our Federal Constitution had quarantined us against widely prevalent misery. Reviewing our successful history Whittier has written confidently,

> "God fills the gaps of human need,
> Each crisis finds its man and deed."

That this will always be so is a comforting and courage begetting faith, but it is faith and not knowledge; it has its origin in religion and not in science. Perhaps at the present time we do not need an antidote for the old-fashioned Fourth of July oration and certainly not for the serene optimism of Whittier. And yet the ghost of national vain-gloriousness still haunts us, and blind optimism still paralyses some of us, as blind pessimism paralyses others.

It would be strange indeed if a form of government had been found that guaranteed national sucess. Many students of institutions from Sir Henry Maine down have undertaken to show that popular government is even a particularly unstable form of government. In some countries, says Sir Henry, they date events from a great earthquake. But in other places earthquakes are so common that they date events from some memorable year in which there was no earthquake at all; and he tries to show that in democratic governments turmoil is the rule and quiet the exception.

To an extent this critic is right. Republican governments are relatively unstable. That is one of their special advantages sociologically considered. One merit of democracy consists in this, that it is impossible so to organize a lot of self-seeking and vindicative rascals as that they shall form a stable republic. They must cease to be rascals or perish. The justification of the republican form of government is to be found not in its mechanical efficiency, but in the fact that it tends either towards making a better and better class of men of those who live under it, or, if they fail to improve and to live up to their responsibilities, then it gives them constant and much nedded opportunities for cutting each others throats. If those who live under a republican government insist on going to the bad they can go in a hurry. If evil triumphs in their individual hearts it will speedily triumph nationally and socially, "And darkness be the burier of the dead." This is as it should be. Some autocratic governments ruling populations of inferior quality are yet comparatively stable, the salt of authority saving them from decay; but to the citizens of every republic comes the voice of doom, "Improve, live, grow; or the forces of putrefaction will begin upon you at once."

Our government makes all times critical and all virtues worth while. Not only are we not quarantined against the triumph of evil, but we are so organized that if we dare to let it triumph we shall be instantly proven unfit and eliminated with special completeness and despatch. No despot benevolent or other will keep us alive to pay his taxes or feed his cannon. A republic is a preliminary day of judgment. To the fit it brings universal education; to the unfit it brings extermination. Science knows of nothing but a balance of forces. If "we the people of the United States" persist in being worthy of a republic we can have one. If not, not.

While our own government is thus specially dependent upon the character of the people for its perpetuity, the same dependence exists to a greater or less degree in all govern-

ments. While machinery is important, character is fundamentally important. If we wished proof that character is a prime element in successful government we might get evidence to that effect by considering the histories of nations that have succeeded in spite of awkward governmental machinery. The more one studies the early government of the city of Rome the more he is convinced that that government was the most illogical, awkward, unworkable piece of government machinery ever devised by the wit of man. (The absurdities and complexities of the Charter of Greater New York are nothing when compared to it.) At the head we have two consuls with co-ordinate powers, who must consequently agree before anything can be done. Then there are tribunes of the people who can veto any action that the consuls or the legislative assemblies may agree on. Next come the priests who can block proceedings because of their knowledge of the will of the gods. The legislative assemblies are archaic in organization and conflicting in their powers. The senate, which has the most dignity and influence, has the least formal right to exercise authority. The law is a body of judicial interpretation of a code almost as simple as our ten commandments. Whatever in it is most peculiar and most awkward is most likely to be distinctively Roman. How a people could live, and prosper, and conquer under such a government is almost inconceivable. But they did. More than this is true. They were most vigorous when their government was most illogical and absurd. As the absurdities and iniquities of the system were weeded out Roman manhood decayed. By the time the Corpus Juris Civilis was in shape to be the admiration of all succeeding students of jurisprudence the emperor who promulgated it lived at Constantinople instead of Rome. The form was perfected; the life had almost passed away. Private rights were much better understood and much less respected. In early Rome women had almost no legal rights at all, and yet the Roman matrons of that time held the very highest position of dignity and respect. In

later Rome the individual rights of women were more fully and justly formulated than in any of the systems of modern law, and yet legislators were cudgelling their brains to devise ways of stopping an epidemic of suicide among Roman women.

It would be absurd to think that justice had brought degeneration or that increase of reasoned knowledge unmanned the Romans. But it is clear that the development of the forms of justice, and the progressive accumulation of knowledge did not prevent the corruption of the citizenship and the consequent fall of the empire. The machine was perfected. The men decayed.

Theoretically considered the English government is almost as awkward as the Roman, and probably more awkward than that of any other civilized people. And yet under it and through it the English people have achieved a more imperial success than any nation, not excepting Rome herself.

From the history of nations that have succeeded in spite of illogically planned governments it were easy to turn to the history of peoples that have come to ruin through the decay of individual character, and in spite of institutions apparently well constructed. The form of governments counts for something but not for everything, as witness the histories of France, of Spain, and of the South American republics. A yet clearer view of the influence of individual character upon national welfare may be obtained by turning from history to literature. There is an opportunity for some one to write a paper upon Tennyson's "Idyls of the King" as a study in social science. The story of the rise and fall of the mythical kingdom, built up as it seems to have been from the imagination of many poets, and finally given shape and form by the Laureate of modern England, gives a completer view than matter-of-fact history usually affords of the processes by which strong nations rise, and of the causes that bring their fall. The account is not only completer than actual history can be, but it is also truer,

for a poetical imagination often sees things more clearly, more nearly in their right relations, than do the dull eyes of "realism" searching among the muck heaps of experience.

The kingdom of Arthur was founded upon personal courage and personal loyalty to ideals and to fellow-men. The best that was in the individuals came out and was offered freely in the common service. Grouped about the king, the Christian forces not only "smote the heathen and upheld the Christ," but established justice and prosperity among themselves. Yet even before success was complete failure was preparing through moral break-down, and when at last it was true that "all the ways were safe from shore to shore" it was also true "that in the heart of Arthur pain was lord." When the king returned from razing the last robber stronghold he came to a court unhappy, immoral, disloyal; to a following more likely to help the Danes than to help him against the Danes; to a people whom no military triumphs could make great because they were mutually faithless and distrustful. The swords had in them the same steel as of old, the form of government remained unchanged, but the hearts of the sword-bearers were vicious and rotten and weak, and even the king himself had scant zest for a battle in which victory could bring no real triumph.

The widening area of social decay that may have its source in personal corruption has never been better described than in the stately pages where the influence of Guinevere's infidelity is followed through many years, and in the careers of many and of various men and women. Not lust alone gets excuse to flourish from this "high example," but from the same bad source hatred, and jealousy, and infidelity, and treason, and murder reinforce themselves through all the court and kingdom. Launcelot holds his place, and his courage and outward courtesy, but the weakness of evil is upon him; and from this mightiest of the knights who sits idly by while tourney rules are broken, and who longs to answer Tristam's gibes by a struggle to the

death, down through all sorts and conditions of men, even to the robber crowds whose effrontery is increased by knowledge of evil done at Camelot, the widening influence of the sin of Guinevere is traced. The attractiveness of evil is steadily set forth, but just as steadily is portrayed the destructiveness of evil. In the careers of individuals and in the history of the state material success goes down in rottenness and ruin through moral failure. Under the show of health the poet finds disease, and from the social heart itself he

"Uncoils, and stretches stark the worm of hell."

What the poets make happen in the mythical kingdom of Arthur, happens in fact wherever and whenever wealth, or power, or even knowledge "accumulates and men decay." The constructive imagination of the poets merely brings out more strongly the lines of influence that actually exist in all societies; lines that join the most private life of the individual with public issues, and that make national success finally dependent upon personal morality.

In industry just as in politics it is true, though we did not dwell upon it, that there must be healthy individuals or the best industrial anatomy will not work. In each department of our collective living two things are necessary to health: first, sound individuals, and second, proper organization. If evil triumphs in either branch of either department, disease will spread throughout the social body. A defect in organization reacts upon and deteriorates the individuals. Any deterioration on the part of individuals has its baleful influence upon the social life. Emphasis has been different in the two cases because it seems to be true that while the chief present need in industry is a different and better organization, the chief present need in politics is sounder manhood and more active loyalty.

What I wish especially to bring out this morning is the duty of each individual, of you and of me, in the premises. In the work of organizing or reorganizing industrial or social affairs the duties of different individuals are different. We

act according to our several conditions and abilities and preparation. In this work some of us may have hardly any duties at all, except not to be obstructionists. But the surest social service that any man can render is one that any man can render: it is to do his utmost to make himself a healthy integer for incorporation in the social aggregate. We repeat, social machinery is important, but sound individuals are fundamentally important. Would you render a social service? Be a man. Diseases are many, but they all work together for the destruction of health. Even though there be no social cataclysm, even though we be not tending toward a national or general triumph of evil, yet evil has its despicable triumphs wherever and whenever it is permitted to exist. Every day it triumphs somewhat, lessening each success and detracting from the possible maximum of health. There can be nothing in the individual that is weak or impure without a corresponding social reaction. Every yielding to an unhealthy appetite, every covetous or unjust act, every entertainment of a lustful thought, every false word or false deed, no matter how well hidden, no matter how much covered by other thoughts and acts of virtue, does something to limit health and reenforce the agencies of putrefaction.

Why do charitable societies often accomplish so little towards the so-called uplifting of the poor? Often and often it is because their managers and supporters and agents come so far short of the man and womanhood that they undertake to teach to others. What limits the influence of the church? Often and often it is the limitations of the church people. What created a soul under the ribs of the dead empire of Rome? Two things, the new blood of the north, and the revivifying influence of Christianity. The new forces used the skeleton; we are using it yet; a knowledge of its efficient and ingenious articulations is and forever will be a help to the churchman, the statesman, the jurist, and the plain citizen. But the new life came from life, and not from the bones of the dead. Persons, inspired

by loyalty to a great Personality, gave vigor and power of growth to the new nations.

Sound character, if there is enough of it, will force its way through great mechanical hindrances. For a certain portion of the character that is to supply the power of work and growth to the social organism of the present you are inevitably and individually responsible. Machinery cannot relieve you of this responsibility; all churches and all other institutions whatsoever can do no more than help you a little in meeting it. Over some small fraction of the social forces your will is law, and if you do your best to give it right direction you have done something.

"I have a belief of my own and it comforts me," says one of George Eliot's characters, "that by desiring what is perfectly good, even when we don't quite know what it is and cannot do what we would, we are part of the divine power against evil—widening the skirts of light, and making the struggle with darkness narrower." The one social service which you can surely render is, therefore, to "keep your heart with all diligence, for out of it are the issues," not only of individual, but of collective life.

III.

WHEN CHANGES COME.

At the close of his speech on "Conciliation with America," Edmund Burke addressed the British House of Commons as follows.

"Magnanimity in politics is not seldom the truest wisdom; and a great empire and little minds go ill together. If we are conscious of our situation, and glow with zeal to fill our place as becomes our station and ourselves, we ought to auspicate all our public proceedings on America with the old warning of the church, 'Sursum Corda!' We ought to elevate our minds to the greatness of that trust to which the order of Providence has called us."

But on that same 22d day of March, 1775, Thurlow, the Attorney-General, followed Burke in a speech adroitly appealing to the littleness of party feeling, and when the vote was taken 78 members voted with Burke, and 270 with the Attorney-General. The hearts of the fox-hunting members of the House of Commons were not lifted, and the mismanaged empire went blundering forward to disaster. In the simple words used by Abraham Lincoln concerning a later crisis, "And the war came." We do not know what form the institutions of the English-speaking world would have taken had England followed the advice of Burke, but we do know that she afterwards regarded her action then as a mistake which she has been careful not to repeat. We further know that for a time of crisis and change Burke's attitude was right. Without regard to the expediency of the exact measures he recommended, it can be said unhesitatingly that the spirit in which he met the crisis was the proper one. The people to whom comes the gift of growth, of expansion, of change, must, if they would avoid disaster, "elevate their minds to the greatness of that trust to which

the order of Providence has called them," must rise above petty selfishness and party blindness, must plan for the future guided by the past, must be broadly wise, must "lift their hearts."

Change, we are happy to think, is the order of our own time, and it is. The hurrying presses can hardly bring us news of changes as fast as they occur. On the material side the diverse movements are pretty well recorded, but in institutional matters the changes are often not manifest until they are complete. Yet growth is frequently a dangerous process, and changes, whether of birth or death or development, are seldom painless. As England met the inevitable change of relations with her growing colonies in the wrong way and suffered therefrom, so the very changes on which we pride ourselves give us ever present opportunities for blundering and suffering. We live in a time of chronic crisis, of unintermittent responsibility for right development. The changes that we see, and more especially those that occur unheralded, bring severally and collectively imperative demands for constructive leadership, for intelligent radicalism. As we turned our attention one week ago chiefly to the social importance of having healthy individuals as a prerequisite of good organization, let us to-day examine a little more closely the duties of the individual towards the machinery of which he forms a part. Private virtue is fundamentally important, but the art of living together will not be fully mastered until many public virtues have been added to the individual's equipment for collective living. Loyalty, civic courage, the lifted heart for which Burke pleaded, are also essential in times like ours.

Perhaps all of us are a little blasé in the matter of crises. They are so very common. Politicians encounter them and tell us of them annually, or biennially, or quadrennially, according to the length of time for which the aforesaid politicians are elected to office. We listen with dull ears and inattentive minds to the stirring appeals to rouse ourselves. The educated classes especially lose interest in the alleged

crises, and we are inclined to look on indifferently as the country "is saved or ruined in quadrennial turns." We seem to live along somehow no matter what party governs us, and in spite of apathy among those we speak of as our best citizens. The conclusion fixes itself upon us that we are bound to come out right in the long run, and the people who get excited and try to excite others are probably shallow and unreasonable disturbers of the peace.

A further and opposite cause of apathy on the part of moderately reflective persons is that the completed reforms of the last hundred and twenty-five years seem not to have accomplished what was expected of them. During the period mentioned—a period when social consciousness has been more acute than ever before—there has been a constant succession of enthusiasts who believed that the millennium was just around the corner. The cohorts of progress have been constantly rallied with the cry, "One fight more, the best and the last." Abolish kings, secure American independence, establish universal male suffrage, emancipate and enfranchise the blacks—all these things have we done and still we are not happy. Can it seem strange that when the advocates of prohibition of the liquor traffic, or of woman suffrage, or of civil service reform, or of industrial arbitration, or of international arbitration, or of the referendum, or of government management of industry, or of the single tax, attempt to rouse us with the old cries, with the old promises of an imminent millennium, that we are apathetic and very tired? That many should feel that they are being made donkeys of and tricked into following a wisp of hay that they can never reach? Each set of reformers was prone to think that it was accomplishing the one thing needful, but after all the striving and achievement we are credibly informed that the single plank which all social platforms have in common is this: "The times are out of joint."

Are there any genuine crises after all? Let us eat, drink and be peaceable, for violent effort seems to produce but

very little effect on social development. Worn out by apathetic discouragement, or paralyzed by apathetic and unthinking hopefulness, with our hearing dulled by the din of ill-timed exhortation, we are content to let matters take their course, to spare the forces of social development the disturbing influence of our personal activity.

The trouble is that the crises that we hear most about in current politics are the least real. The great questions that have reached settlement in the last hundred and twenty-five years have almost without exception received only belated attention from the practical politicians, and have had to force their way to the front through swarms of lesser issues. In Burke's time the people to whom he spoke thought that the really critical question of the period was whether Whigs or Tories should fill the offices, so they voted with the Attorney-General. In our own history the tariff question has received an amount of attention out of all proportion to its importance. It is tolerably certain that this country must have become great and prosperous under either a revenue tariff or a protective tariff, and it is still more certain that the country would have done vastly better under either policy consistently followed than it has under the policy of vacillation between the two which has resulted from constant discussion. The politicians having become accustomed to discuss this question, and having aligned themselves with reference to it, would never let us vote on anything else if they could help themselves. Many publicists aid them to exaggerate the importance of the tariff, the feeling having come over in English text-books that because the repeal of the corn laws was vitally important to England the repeal or enactment of tariff legislation must be vitally important to the United States. It was most distressing to the politicians when the people insisted on dropping the tariff issue and on taking up the money question. The old war horses of politics shrank from campaigning on the silver issue in 1896, because it was new to them; but admittedly the real crisis in monetary affairs had come twenty-three years

earlier. The discussion was just about a quarter of a century behind time. The change, the crisis, had come "like a thief in the night," and we do not need to believe that there was conscious conspiracy to make it come so, because that is the way that real changes very commonly come. Changes are taking place now as important, as fateful, as unnoticed. Let us glance hastily at three of these changes. The first has to do primarily with the mechanics of collective living, the second with industrial and social structure, and the third with social philosophy.

It must be premised, however, that the feeling that nothing has been accomplished by past reforms is a mistake. The millennium is not here, but we might be a great deal worse off than we are. As a people we are not perfectly healthy, but we are at least not dead, and there are some diseases that we have escaped or been cured of. We have had more than a century of relatively healthful life. Because the present times are critical, that is, because there is a chance and even an imminent danger of our suffering from other and more modern diseases, it does not follow that our predecessors accomplished nothing. Many different things are essential to health. A man who is threatened with nervous prostration need not complain that he has got no benefit from his expenditures to secure good water supply and drainage. The sacrifices of the Pilgrim Fathers in leaving England could not free their descendants from the further sacrifices entailed by the necessity of fighting England. It was a necessary thing to abolish slavery, but that could not be expected to solve modern labor problems. The utmost sacrifice that one generation can make may be necessary to save the life of a nation, but afterwards there will be other dangers and need of further sacrifice.

"New occasions teach new duties; time makes ancient good uncouth,
They must upward, still, and onward who would keep abreast of truth."

As we turn to examine some of these new duties let us look first at the semi-mechanical side of life and the great

changes in national and social organization that have come from the existence and dominance of the railroads. I do not mean the political dominance of the railroads. That may or may not in given times and places be a fact. But it is an undisputed and general fact that our whole national life is organized differently than it would have been except for the existence of railroads. To begin with, our federal union could hardly have been preserved without them. In addition, our population is greater and differently located than it could possibly have been without them. As now placed, great numbers of our people are as dependent for existence upon the continued operation of the railroads as they are upon the continued firmness of the ground upon which they stand. Cities have been made and unmade by them, districts fostered or blasted, businesses built up or destroyed, personal fortunes of those not railroad men have been amassed and melted down, and combinations or trusts promoted far more efficiently than any tariff legislation whatever could have promoted them. The railroads themselves have been so cumbrously organized, have grown so beyond all the previous experience of business managers that they have not been well, often not honestly managed, and have been disastrous investments in many cases. In the building and administering of railroads capitalist has fought capitalist, and they have suffered vastly more from their own contentions, road against road or faction against faction, than from adverse legislation.

Their legitimate and necessary influence has been to make concentration of population and combinations in trade ultimately possible. Their greatest illicit influence has been to unduly hurry concentration of population, and to make trade combinations suddenly and savagely triumphant. Because we did not attend to the railroads in time nor with sufficient efficiency when we did try to regulate them, the problems of other changes have been forced upon us with needless haste.

These two consequences of railroad domination alone

bring problems that might keep a generation or two on the anxious seat. Take the matter of combinations in trade. Many editors keep watch for the failure of each trust or combination, and when it goes down say, "Such things never last long; they come and go. Competition is bound to have its way. Long live competition!" But of late years these combinations have come rather oftener than they have gone, and a relatively large number of permanent ones are accumulating among the industries of the land. The only people in places of power who have given combinations serious study are the courts, and they have been disposed until recently to study them by consulting Coke on Lyttleton. The leading aim of the cheap politician is to appear to be an enemy of the trusts without hurting them any. Legitimate and irresistible forces seem to be back of the combinations, though they have in this country been furthered by illegitimate and factitious forces.

How shall prices be regulated if competition fails to regulate them, and if the economists continue to insist that government regulation is in every way objectionable and unbearable? A change is upon us. Are we going to be a quarter of a century behindhand in dealing with this as in dealing with other changes?

Take the second change that the mismanaged railroads have unduly hastened, viz.: the predominance of cities. The amazing growth of great cities is the fairy tale which every writer on social problems feels bound to rehearse. Men have always wanted to huddle together, and the growth of large cities was an inevitable consequence of the modern mechanical improvements that made large cities possible. The appliances having been found for housing, feeding, watering and cleaning populations concentrated on a small area, population was bound to become concentrated. Orators, editors and teachers of social science, nearly all of whom are themselves truants from the plough-tails, may inveigh against the drift to the cities, but their exhortation and invective will not stem the current which in practice they did not

themselves resist. Thus it comes about that most of us will have our parts to play as constituent elements of that great artificial person, a municipality, and nowhere does that critical thing we call change come more swiftly than in the modern city.

Mechanically taken, the organization of the city is wonderfully efficient. Transit, horizontal and vertical, for persons, materials and power, follows a network of tracks ranging from the cobweb of wires or the mighty conduits of the water system to the striding avenues of the elevated roads, to the confused orderliness of the ferry-boats and steamships, and to the lacework of railway switches where forty-ton locomotives glide up and down in ponderous haste. But if we turn from the mechanical to the human side of the city, order gives place to confusion. Legislature and town council and mayor are wrangling together over patronage, struggling classes contend with one another, and brawling and uncandid newspapers add to the general confusion. At its worst the modern American city represents on its human or social side almost what we might expect on the mechanical side if all the approaching vessels were piloted by wreckers, and all the railroad switches were set by maniacs.

This is not the place to particularize the problems of life and government in great cities. But their growth has changed the relative importance of federal and local politics, of constitutional and of administrative problems. The change has come. The politicians will ignore it as long as they can. How long will we let them? How long will it be till the hearts of the people of at least one American city shall be lifted to the high level of their present responsibilities?

The second change at the dangers and requirements of which we would glance is that which is bringing about the omnipresence of associated effort, to the exclusion of isolated individual action in either politics, education or business. The artificial person, the corporation in some of its

many forms, is triumphant everywhere, and the great realm of business life has been subdued very recently but very completely. John Stuart Mill said that any industrial task that could only be best done by means of a corporation might as well be taken over by the government. If we believed that to-day, the government would do nearly everything. The changes brought by the success of the railroads were primarily material, and consequently attracted considerable attention. This second change is primarily one of social structure and has been only casually remarked upon. Let us examine a little more carefully the implications of this change. Perhaps a trivial illustration taken from the microcosm of college life will help to unfold the subject.

Have you ever belonged to any small organization such as a debating club or a stock company, or a Sunday-school association, or a culture club, where your own personal influence and that of your acquaintances could be easily traced? Have you ever watched such a weak artificial person of which you formed an active and directing part, grow, and change and become vigorous, or on the other hand get sick and anemic and die? I have in mind a literary society in a western university which is now older than most of its present active members, that is a little more than twenty-five years old. As the life of a generation of college students is only four years, the membership of this society has entirely changed six times since its history began, and yet it has in no wise lost its identity. But we must look beneath the surface before we can see how that continuity of purpose has been maintained. Each generation of members has contained individuals whose selfishness or indifference, had they been general, would have led to the decadence and death of the society. There has further been a constant need for the society to adapt itself in new ways to the greater institution of which it forms a part. The years have brought many changes to the university and to the State. Some of these changes might easily have swept the

literary society out of existence had its members not known how to modify it, and adapt it, and make it progressively helpful to the changing student body. It continues to live and prosper by virtue of the fact that each generation of members has contained enough persons who were intelligently loyal to its welfare, so that it was changed and guarded and made to live on prosperously and helpfully. Life and duty were more complicated for each of us because of our membership in the society. Our personal friendships got tangled and strained. Our duties to the society sometimes interfered with our duties in the class-room and elsewhere.

This literary society is a small affair. It is not of great importance to many people what becomes of such an organization. But it is important what happens to a municipal corporation, and that is only an artificial person of a different kind. It is important what a great railroad company does, and that is only an artificial person of another type.

The complications that result in student life from loyalty to various organizations are as nothing to the mighty entanglements that have come to business life and to society from the countless interlacing organizations to which the modern man belongs. Life has become intricate and morals complicated. Jay Gould's position as an "Erie man" obliterates for his money darkened conscience his duties as a citizen. If public interests interfere with private gain, the man who is loyal first to his money-getting company will be inclined to echo the reported sentiment of Vanderbilt, "The public be damned." The times when ecclesiastical corporations dominated the state have come again, only now it is the business corporations that secure the paramount of allegiance of powerful men. We need right now a new and enlarged edition of the ten commandments for the special use of corporation attorneys and corporation managers. "Thou shalt not steal" is archaic in its simplicity. Few people steal nowadays, but the corporations to which many

people belong acquire wealth with undue rapidity. The jangle of interests in a modern municipality is largely a jangle of corporations. Things are so dreadfully tangled that those whom we call our " best citizens " are often on the side of municipal corruption; they do not want a city government too altogether honest or the companies they are interested in cannot secure the privileges that they need in their business.

The man who, as an agent of a corporation, actually does evil is often not personally corrupt. He gets a salary and does what he is told to do. The management that employs him and that gets the profits of what he does is not manifestly evil. It does not order its agents to do wrong, it merely orders them to do things that while not wrong in themselves cannot in fact be accomplished without doing wrong. Who is guilty? Everybody concerned or nobody? The world to-day cannot make up its mind whether a large number of its most successful business men are thieves and robbers, or whether they are only abnormally smart. They are so immensely clever in devising new ways to get rich that they keep several lengths ahead of the revised editions of the moral code which are issued from time to time. And the chief means by which they keep ahead of public opinion and sound morals is the artful use of the artificial person or corporation. This omnipresence of corporate action in business is a change which has done more than any other to undermine business morality and to confuse public opinion.

Facing such a charge, what is the proper attitude for the individual? Simply to master the complications of the situation, to rise to the level of his new responsibilities, to insist for himself and others that no man is honest who does not do his very utmost to make every artificial person which he helps to constitute as honest as he would be thought himself. The individual is not lost in modern mechanism, but he has new duties with reference to the vital and throbbing machinery of which he forms a part. As he dis-

charges those duties faithfully or unfaithfully he is an honorable or dishonorable man. We must be eager in advancing and interpreting our standards if the development of business morals is to keep regularly in step with the development of modern business.

The last great change to which we will briefly refer is a change in social philosophy. Reformers of a hundred years ago strove to reach the millennium. We have given that up. They strove each time for some definite and final goal impelled by faith in religious or political dogmas. We are face to face with what Prof. Small calls the epoch-making fact "that to-day's men have gradually cut the moorings of ethical and social tradition after tradition, and that society is to-day adrift, without definite purpose to shape its course, and without a supreme conviction to give it motion."

Here we have a personal responsibility for social welfare that has no known limit in time or in degree. The tardily unsealed order of nature, to quote again from Prof. Small, is this: "Be thou a forceful part of that continuous cosmic enterprise which forever unmakes the things of to-day, to recreate them in the things of to-morrow."

We are evolving, but to what end we cannot see. We are partly responsible for this evolution, and have lately become conscious of our directive influence in shaping its course. The forces of nature that have thus far fashioned us are ready to become our slaves instead of our drivers, to take orders from us instead of giving them to us.

Here we see a change the most fundamental of any, and the most disheartening or most inspiring of any according as we have or have not faith in man or in the powers that guide him—according as we do or do not rise to the requirements of the high calling wherewith we are now called. It seems as though we were expected to go forward into the dark; but, as was said in the first sermon of this series, it is only children who have a right to be afraid of the dark; it is frequently the business of men to go forward into it.

Standing on the threshold of a future that is to be much better or much worse than the past, we must not only use our reason but must rely upon our better instincts, must summon our courage, must "lift our hearts" to the new responsibilities of the time.

Thus, if we will but listen, from all departments of modern life comes up the burr and hum of change, and with the sound of change is always blended the call to higher duties and to better service. As was said one week ago, we stand to-day industrially and socially very much where our fathers stood politically when independence of England had been won, but the more "perfect union" of the States had not been reached. At that time of critical change when it seemed as though the Constitutional Convention might break up without accomplishing its difficult but all-important task, even Benjamin Franklin saw that it was good politics to unite in prayer. He appreciated, as Burke had done before, and as Rudyard Kipling has done in this jubilee year of Queen Victoria, that the spirit of devotion is the only one in which can be reared the superstructure of a lasting state. When Burke, facing that change and crisis in imperial administration, urged magnanimous action upon the House of Commons he did so in words which the church had used for centuries to call its devotees to prayer, "Lift your hearts," for "great empire and little minds go ill together." Since these words were spoken the civilized peoples of the world have conquered yet vaster empires of material force and moral responsibility which now they must administer for the common good or the common harm. It will depend much upon the spirit in which we act whether we go forward to the blunders and disasters of George III or to the successes of the men who established the government of the United States. "If we are conscious of our situation and glow with zeal to fill our place as becomes our station and ourselves," we must believe with Franklin and Burke that in times of change, and crisis, and danger, the

call to political action should be the same as the call to prayer. So believing and remembering we may even hope to meet worthily our present responsibilities, "to elevate our minds to the greatness of that trust to which the order of Providence has called us.

IV.

VICARIOUS SACRIFICE.

A popular lecturer once said he so hated the doctrine that one man could suffer for the sins of another that he had made a solemn vow never to speak upon any subject whatever without in some way contriving to denounce this doctrine and to ridicule it. Another person, a kindly and genial business man who had a habit of dropping into philosophy as Silas Wegg into poetry, was wont to tell at length of the proceedings in Chinese courts of justice. The criminal being sentenced to a certain number of lashes on the naked back is at liberty to hire some one to take the whipping for him. Professional punishment takers hang about the court, and bid excitedly against each other for the job of taking the specified number of stripes. One of them, having underbid the others, takes the prescribed whipping, and justice is satisfied. "But that," the raconteur would add, looking about to see if there was anyone present who would take up his challenge, "appears to me a reasonable system of administering justice compared with one in which the son of the ruler is put to death as an atonement for the disobedience of the subjects."

Baldly stated, the doctrine of vicarious sacrifice seems hideous enough. The real transgressor escapes retribution and the punishment falls, more or less blindly directed, upon an innocent party who may or may not be willing to make the expiatory offering. From the Grecian Iphegenia to the Jewish scapegoat driven into the desert with the sins of the people upon its back, these innocent sufferers for the sins of others appear constantly in the pages of myth and legend and religious history. Sometimes the innocent person is offered to appease a god who delights in sacrificial suffer-

ing and must be given just so much of it in return for disobedience, and sometimes, as in the Greek legends, the sacrifice is demanded by a destiny too impersonal to feel hatred or delight, but as unswerving as what we call in modern times the Laws of Nature. Whether it be an impersonal fate or a malign god that requires the suffering of the innocent, it is certainly true that the religions of the world bristle with instances of vicarious sacrifice atoning for the sins of the guilty. Are the religions in this perverse and abominable? Have their inventors foisted some gratuitous horror upon the world? Is the doctrine of vicarious sacrifice a needless nightmare of belief?

Whatever else may be true of them it is certain that the religions of the world are not inventions but growths, and anything that is common to as many of them as is the doctrine of vicarious sacrifice presumptively reflects conditions that are common and perhaps inevitable. This despised and abominated doctrine that the innocent must suffer for the guilty, and that under proper conditions the guilty are relieved of some of the consequences of wrong-doing through the suffering of the innocent, is not based wholly upon religious dogma. To a very considerable extent it represents not a theory but a condition, and is nothing more than a straightforward statement of fact, of what has been observed to happen.

Various peoples have constructed various theories to account for the fact, as they have to account for sunrise, and the seasons, and the movements of the planets; but back of all their theorizing this phenomenon has its place along with the other phenomena which they have been seeking to explain. Savages would not have had a theory about a dragon trying at times to swallow the sun if there had been no solar eclipses. Neither would they have imagined a malignant deity inflicting expiatory sufferings upon the innocent if such sufferings had not been frequently observed to fall upon the innocent. In practically all times and places the fact has ex-

isted, and the religions of the world merely try to account for it. Let us try to examine the fact in a few of its many bearings without at all trying to explain it.

That wrong-doing has bad effects on others than the wrong-doers is too common and too commonly observed to need much dwelling on. The murderer who has been duly hanged is not more dead than his innocent victim, and about each of them is a wide circle of relatives and associates and fellow-citizens who must take more or less of the consequences of both the misdeed and its expiation. While it might be very nice if all adults could take the consequences of their own action and of nobody else's, society is not arranged that way. "He has paid the penalty" we hear it said after some noted debauchee or great defaulter has committed suicide; and then follows the reflection, "Yes, but how many others have paid it with him?" Often the one who makes a mistake or commits a crime escapes most of the consequences. The engineer or builder of a great dam is at fault, and the people of Johnstown are swept out of existence. When the tower of Siloam falls, exact justice would prescribe that only the architect and master builder should be under it. But these worthies had no doubt long since passed away. "Think ye they were sinners above all others on whom the tower of Siloam fell? I tell ye nay."

Perhaps the wife whose husband becomes a drunkard deserves to suffer for the mistake or weakness of having associated herself with a man not finally able to control his appetites; but it hardly seems just that she, as is commonly the case, should suffer far more than the brute who inflicts the suffering. The people who introduced slavery into the American colonies made a mistake and perhaps committed a sin. They were not punished for it, at least not in this world. In the northern colonies where slavery did not pay, their descendants were not much punished for it except during a great national convulsion. But at the South, where it proved that slavery did pay, and where it continued to pay

increasingly large returns because of inventions and development that no one could have foreseen, the descendants of its introducers were most grievously punished and are being punished yet. This leaves the evils suffered by the blacks entirely out of the quesion. "After me the deluge," said Louis XIV, and the deluge did come long after he had passed away, and it submerged the only well-meaning king France had had for nearly two hundred years. Those that sow the wind frequently die and leave the inevitable whirlwind for some one else to reap.

Justice to individuals is not nature's specialty. Their lives are too short for her to take much account of them. Like the Greek fates, she exacts punishment for wrongdoing, but frequently exacts it from those who did not do the wrong. Instead of making special efforts to get only fit people born into the world, nature's way is to bring many into existence and then kill off those who do not suit. "If you want an omelet you must break a few eggs," said the Corsican. "If you want the fit to survive you must smash the unfit, and any others who get mixed up with them," says nature. This is effective, but looks wasteful, and it certainly is rather hard on the unfit who are pitchforked into existence without their consent, and then pitchforked out again because they did not happen to be something else than that which they have been made. Countless millions have been exterminated merely because they did not properly "adapt internal conditions to external conditions;" and yet not one of them ever understood that this was what was required of them until Herbert Spencer said so.

Clearly those who indict the Grecian gods or the Hebrew God for cruelty find but a "stony stepmother" when they fly to nature. That the innocent must suffer, and often must suffer for the sins of the guilty, is a fact so inwrought in all human affairs, so manifest in all the operations of nature, that to quarrel with it is as idle as to quarrel with the precession of the equinoxes.

Weak minds, like the friends who tried to comfort Job, have often taken the contrary view and have insisted that suffering is always and only the consequence of demerit. But any one able to look squarely at facts, like Job himself, has seen that this is not true, and has given up trying to account for existing conditions except by falling back on faith in a higher power, and "believing where he cannot see" "that good shall somehow be the final goal of ill."

It should be said, however, that as the wrong-doer stands a little nearer to the wrong than anybody else he is somewhat more likely to be hit by the consequences. In the long run and on the average this is true. Were it not true no progress would be made and nature would be convicted not only of brutality but of incompetence. This she has never been. Sermons from the text, "The wages sin is death" can be based on facts as well as scripture. Because the innocent often suffer, no one need to conclude that it is a matter of indifference whether or not he is innocent. Even were the physical fortunes of the innocent and guilty the same, which, on the average they are not, conscience and public opinion would make a difference greatly in favor of the innocent. Though the murdered man and the hanged murderer are both dead, most of us would prefer to be the former rather than the latter. Statute law is continually running correction lines through the conditions of life established by non-human nature; doing what it can to make the lot of the transgressor harder and harder; and the religions of the world lend their powerful aid in the same general direction.

After stating this let us see if it can be further shown that any good comes out of the great mass of unearned suffering that falls upon the relatively innocent individuals of the world. This unmerited distress can serve no purpose as a penalty or as a corrective. Is it a sheer waste? Why it comes, whether from an unreasonable and malignant deity or from a blind nature we do not now inquire. There

it is. Is there any good in it? Is there anything saved or salvable from what looks like a mountain of waste? We are trying, you will remember, to keep close to verifiable facts.

From the great mass of undeserved suffering let us take out for examination that part which the sufferers have voluntarily incurred or have joyfully borne in order to shield others from the consequences of misfortune, or weakness, or ignorance, or sin. The quantity of this is not as small as cynics would have us believe.

First of all, there are the enormous sacrifices parents make for their children, both among lower animals and among human beings. Even among as low an order as the birds it is not true that all an individual has he will give for his life. They will give their lives to save their young rather than the reverse. Hunt our California quail when they have no nests or young, and you will find that self-preservation is the first law with them and that they know how to obey it skilfully. Go among them when they have young, and you will find that the law of self-preservation has given way before the higher law of self-sacrifice; the struggle for life has given place to "the struggle for the life of others." Both the parent birds will violate every instinct that made them keep away from you in the winter, will court notice instead of avoiding it, and do everything they can to draw to themselves the dangers arising from your presence.

It is a trivial illustration, but perhaps for that very reason we can view it more calmly than if we took something nearer to ourselves. The struggle to preserve offspring, to shield the immature from suffering which their weakness and inexperience might bring upon them has been treated at length by Drummond, under the name which we have just used, "the struggle for the life of others." A considerable part of each generation sacrifices itself for the next, and the higher we rise in the scale of development the greater and longer continued are the sacrifices. Drummond says that

it might almost be reasoned from the facts that the whole purpose of organic life from the beginning has been the final development of mothers—the mammalia. In this order the sacrifices of parent for child are greatest and in the highest species of the order they are continued through the longest series of years. It were idle to take from literature or human experience examples of parental sacrifice. The members of a student body stand so close to the parental sacrifices by which the individuals have benefited that they see them very clearly in some ways. And yet they will quite certainly obtain a fuller and juster view of them when the perspective and experiences of years have instructed the vision and reduced the varied facts of life to more just proportions.

What have been the consequences of all this sacrifice of the individuals of one generation for the individuals of the next? Is it all a waste? Is there, let us ask in reply, anything better in human affairs than the reciprocal love of parent and child which has its origin in the sacrifice of one for the protection of the other? If the tendency of evolution seems to be in the direction of greater and greater quantities of vicarious sacrifice, is it not bringing also a wealth of pure affection without which the world were poor and bleak?

As the generations of men are bound together by these heavy debts which can never be paid directly, but only by affection and gratitude and the passing on of the obligation to a succeeding generation, so, in some sort, do the sexes stand related to each other. Superficially considered one of them seems to have committed an undue share of the sins of the world, and the other to have borne an undue share of the consequent suffering. More justly stated, one of them has served the race chiefly through action, and the other chiefly through endurance. The history of the physically weaker sex can be so written as to read like one long story of oppression and injustice. But carefully considered

much of what looked like oppression is seen to have no human origin, but to be the result of forces which neither sex could control; of those fundamental forces which have shaped our minds and bodies, and which from the beginning decreed the evolution of sex. As this fact has come to be recognized by both the life of endurance has been transmuted into the life of power. The glory of suffering gladly borne for affection's sake has transformed the woman and subdued the man. When our Civil War came to an end Europe supposed that our armies could not be easily disbanded. There were many reasons that conspired to make our soldiers return gladly to the ways of peace, but perhaps the strongest was this, that so many of the soldiers knew that at home good women were waiting for them and suffering with them, and when the war was over would expect them to be men. So they were drawn back from the life of hardship and excitement and danger to the simple duties of home, and so through all the years is every manly man steadied and upheld and strengthened by the thought of those members of the race who do perhaps less than he but endure more. What he would not do for himself or for selfish gain he is willing to do for the sake of one whose burden is different from his. Thus the overplus of endurance that falls to the lot of one sex becomes, if rightfully received and borne, a source of strength and affection and joy to all, contributing to the relation of the sexes much of that which is purest and noblest in them, and to the general endowment of the human heart an emotion fit to rank with parental and filial love.

Next to the affections which unite us to those near by relationship, one of the strongest human emotions is patriotism, and this also is watered by the blood and tears of self-sacrifice. It is not more true that the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church than that the bodies of those who have willingly died for fatherland make the foundations of national unity and success. To atone for old wrongs or to

insure peace and prosperity to their successors men of all times and many races have been willing to accept and verify in life and death the Roman adage that it is sweet to die for one's country. We can account for the survival of this sentiment by evolutionary philosophy. Races that had it survived, and those that did not have it went to pieces. But from the standpoint of the individual we can account for his action only by assuming that to him the joy of sacrificing himself for others, rendering for their sakes "the last full measure of devotion," was greater than he could realize from any course dictated by what we commonly call selfishness. The unearned suffering that came to him was transmuted by his spirit of devotion into a privilege and a glory.

We have referred to the great suffering entailed upon this country by the mistake or sin of the introduction and toleration of African slavery. Here was a typical case of sin-entailed suffering, and our war President himself suggested the equation that it might be necessary that every drop of blood drawn by the lash should be paid by another drawn by the sword. Yet it was not those whose hands had wielded the lash through two hundred years from whose veins was drawn by the sword the atoning blood. In part it was from their descendants, but largely it came from the young and the strong and the brave of the land who had no measure of personal responsibility whatever for the wrong their lives were given to expiate. We who have come upon the scene since that struggle cannot appreciate it fully, but perhaps we can appreciate it more fully than other struggles because of our nearness to it, and to those who took a part in it. In a magazine no longer published and by an author whom I do not remember, there appeared not very long after the war an account of a night in the Wilderness campaign which gave me a more vivid idea than anything else I have ever read of what sacrifices, on the part of those engaged, the war involved.

It was written by an officer who spent the first part of the

night struggling through roadless and boggy woods to rejoin his company. His horse became disabled and he proceeded on foot. When he found his regiment, they were resting as well as they could in the mud of a slight depression where they were partly shielded from the fire of the enemy. It was raining and the men were sick and weak from lack of sleep and lack of food. Their work for the night was to assault at intervals the opposing breastworks of the enemy, and after each charge up the slippery hill to retire into the mud-hole to rest a little, re-form, and charge again. There was absolutely no hope that they could take the fortifications that they assailed, and yet their attacks were not to be sham attacks. Their work was to keep up a steady and real pounding that would oblige the Confederate general to leave some thousands of his men to defend these breastworks and make it wholly out of the question for him to withdraw them to re-enforce some other part of his line where the Federal forces presumably planned to make a more hopeful attack.

As the officer who tells the story came up an old grey-headed private was asking an officer to excuse him from further service for the night. He was manifestly sick, and said that he had been suffering from dysentery for some days. But the officer to whom he appealed said with the petulance of fatigue that they were all more or less sick, and that anybody who could stand up would have to keep his place in the line. Just as he had given his answer and the applicant was turning away a bullet of unusual reach sped towards them from the enemy, and the old man dropped dead in the mud—excused.

It was along exactly such lines as this that Lieutenant-General Grant had grimly but wisely said that he would "fight it out if it took all summer."

Multiplying such incidents by the thousands, adding the sufferings of the hospitals and the prison pens, remembering that these who suffered were not personally responsible

for the wrong in consequence of which they suffered, and then, speaking of ourselves as a people and of them as individuals, may we not say that "they were wounded for our transgressions, and with their stripes we are healed?"

Nor were the sacrifices of our soldiers in the Civil War so very exceptional or unparalleled. Whatever period of history we are able to make living and real, we find there the same sacrifice of the individual for the healing of the nations. The oft-quoted aphorism that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty" means nothing else than that a nation worth having depends for its health and life upon the free-will offering of individuals in personal sacrifices equally real though not always so bloody.

From sacrifices for the nation we might turn to sacrifices for the church. But there the element of faith, and of belief in a future life introduces a new calculus of rewards and punishments which might be confusing. Instead let us take another example of what may be called secular self-sacrifice, and we shall not need to go outside our college home to look for it.

In university communities we hear much talk about the cultivation of pure science and seeking truth for truth's sake. Now of course a man may seek truth for ambition's sake, or for greed's sake, or for any other selfish motive. But if he makes real sacrifices for the sake of establishing truth is it not because he feels that all truth is useful in one way or another, now or later? Is he not by the sacrifices he makes doing something to take upon himself a part of the burden of the unearned suffering of the world? Is he not striving by the gift of himself to lessen the sum of the world's mistakes and misdoings? And is not this distinctively modern form of self-sacrifice one of the best and most efficient forms? The old self-sacrifice walked the pestilential streets to aid the sick and bury the dead. The new does the slow work of the laboratory which shall prevent the plague or stamp it out forever. The Red Cross

still has its heroes and heroines, but so has the cause of international arbitration. The new sacrifice is that which is given for prevention, admittedly better than cure. Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes, who understood both society and medicine so well, was always insisting upon the importance of preventive as compared with curative medicine. After the doctor is called there is commonly nothing to be done but to make the best of a bad business. Speaking of medical science Dr. Holmes says:

> "Though on the field that death has won,
> She save some stragglers in retreat;
> These single acts of mercy done
> Are but confessions of defeat."

One of the kindliest and most efficient superintendents of an insane asylum in the United States said that he considered that the very best, and ultimately the most helpful, work in his institution was that done in a room off the mortuary where a young specialist with all the appliances of science was studying the brains of the dead.

To be sure, one can be both a scientist and a hog, just as the individual in any heroic army may be a plunderer or a bravo. But if the spirit of the worker is right, the laboratory and the library give opportunities for pure sacrifice of self in lofty service as well as do the battlefield and the hospital. He who really gives himself through years of laborious service has made as complete a sacrifice as though upon any battlefield of the world he had "poured out his soul unto death."

We might go on and multiply examples of ways in which men and women in all the walks of life can and do give themselves for the healing of the wounds of the world. In countless places and in unseen ways both the great and the humble are making their own the prayer of George Eliot, "May I be to other souls the cup of strength in some great agony."

Self-sacrifice is not an unusual and isolated thing exemplified only in Jim Bludsoes or Conductor Bradleys, or told

of in religious fables which we are free to disbelieve. On the contrary it is a common and fundamental fact. Society relies upon it, and not in vain.

Why is so much undeserved suffering in the world? I do not know. But this seems clear, that when any part of that suffering is taken up and borne for love's sake a new portion of moral health and hopefulness comes in to strengthen and bless the world.

"Wherever through the ages rise
The altars of self-sacrifice,
Where love its arms hath opened wide,
Or man for man hath calmly died,
I see the same white wings outspread,
That hovered o'er the Master's head.
Up from undated time they come
The martyr souls of heathendom,
And to his cross and passion bring
Their fellowship of suffering.

. . . . . .

Good cause it is for thankfulness
That the world blessing of His life
With the long past is not at strife;
That the great marvel of His death
To the one order witnesseth,
No doubt of changeless goodness wakes,
No link of cause and sequence breaks,
But, one with nature, rooted is
In the eternal verities;
Whereby, while differing in degree,
As finite from infinity,
The pain and loss for others borne,
Love's crown of suffering meekly worn,
The life man giveth for his friend
Become vicarious in the end;
Their healing place in nature take
And make life sweeter for their sake."

AMOS GRISWOLD WARNER. Fellow, Johns Hopkins University, 1886; Ph. D., 1888; General Secretary, Charity Organization Society, Baltimore, 1887-1889; Professor, University of Nebraska, 1889-1891; Superintendent of Charities in the District of Columbia, 1891-1893; Lecturer, J. H. U., 1892-1893; Professor, Stanford University, 1893-1900. Died Jan. 17, 1900.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Le Play's Studies in Social Phenomena: (Popular Science Monthly, Oct., 1886.)

The Charities of Baltimore: (Report published by Charity Organization Society, 1887.)

Sketches from Territorial History: (Reports of the Nebraska State Historical Society, Vol. II, Lincoln, 1887.)

A Nest of Wild Cats (Wild Cat Banks in Nebraska): (Overland Monthly, Aug., 1887.)

Three Phases of Coöperation in the West: (Pubs. of American Economic Association, Vol. II, No. 1, 1887.)

Begging as a Business: (Baltimore American, Nov. 15, 1887.)

The Organization of Charity: (Baltimore Sun, 1887.)

L'Organisation de la Charité aux Etats-Unis: (La Réforme Sociale, Jan. 15, 1888.)

Rural Poor Administration in Germany: (International Record of Charities and Corrections, Aug. 1888.)

The West: (In "The History of Coöperation in the U. S." J. H. Univ. Studies, 6th Series, 1888.)

Charity Organization at the 15th National Conference: (The Monthly Register, 1888.)

The Charities of Baltimore: (The Civil Service Reformer, Jan., 1889.)

Notes on the Statistical Determination of the Causes of Poverty: (Pubs. of the American Statistical Assoc., New Series, No 5, Mch., 1889.)

Economic Notes regarding Luxury: (Proc. of American Assoc. for the Advancement of Science, Vol. 38. Salem, 1889.)

Our Charities and our Churches. Paper presented at the 16th Annual Conference of Charities and Corrections at San Francisco: (Proceedings of the Conference, Boston, 1889.)

Anti-poverty Cure-alls: (College and School, Dec., 1889.)

Charities: (Notes Supplementary to the J. H. Univ. Studies, No. 7, 1889.)

Scientific Charity. (Popular Science Monthly, Aug., 1889.)

Concerning Corporation Law: (Ib., July, 1890.)

Some Experiments on Behalf of the Unemployed: (Quarterly Journal of Economics, Oct., 1890.)

Political Science in American State Universities. Address before Neb. State Hist. Soc., Jan. 9, 1889: (Transactions and Reports of the Society, Vol. III, Lincoln, 1891.)

Railway Problems in a Western State: (Political Science Quarterly, Mch., 1891.)

Political Economy in Academies and High Schools: (The Congregationalist, Mch. 19, 1891.)

The Conference of Charities Reviewed: (The Congregationalist, May 28, 1891.)

Benjamin Scott's "A State Iniquity": (Political Science Quarterly, June, 1891.)

The Railroads and the Farmers of Nebraska: (The Independent, Sept. 3, 1891.)

Barwick's "War with Crime" and Ellis' "The Criminal": (Political Science Quarterly, Vol. V, No. 3.)

State Railroad Commissions: (Annals of American Academy, May, 1892.)

German Labor Colonies: (Quarterly Journal of Economics, July, 1892.)

Coöperation with Public Authorities: (Charities Review, Nov., 1892.)

Organized Charity: (Lend a Hand, Dec., 1892.)

Possible Careers for Students of Social Science: (The Stanford Sequoia, May 3, 1903.)

Philanthropy in American Colleges: (The Congregationalist, Aug. 16, 1894.)

American Charities: A Study in Philanthropy and Economics: (New York, Crowell, 1894. 12mo.)

The Causes of Poverty further considered: (American Statistical Assoc., Sept., 1894.)

Consciences and Corporations: (Public Opinion, March 28, 1895.)

Politics and Crime: An Address delivered before the National Prison Congress, Denver, Sept. 16, 1895. (American Journal of Sociology, Nov., 1895.)

Something on Reformation: (Charities Review, Nov., 1895.)

The World in Review: (North Western Monthly, Sept.-Oct., 1897.)

ARTICLES IN THE "RECORD AND GUIDE":

(New York)

1889.

A Broader Outlook. May 18.
Monopolies of Service in American Cities. July 6.
English Municipal Government. July 27.
Western Realty Mortgages. Aug. 17.
Tangled Charities. Sept. 14.
A Topic of The Hour. Sept. 28.
Honor Offices in German Cities. Oct. 26.
Political Aspects of Local Taxation. Nov. 16.
A Proposed Solution of the Silver Problem. Dec. 14.
Various Aspects of Western Irrigation. Dec. 28.

1890.

Volunteer Health Officers. Jan. 11.
Statutory Corporation Law. March 8.
Railroads and Real Estate at The West. March 29.
The Better Side of Monopolies. May 17.
How to Perpetuate Pauperism. May 24.
Methods of Taxing Corporations. June 21.
Americans as Legislators. July 28.
The Classifications of Corporations. Aug. 6.
First Law in Modern Industry. Sept. 6.
The Rationale of Sentences for Crime. Sept. 13.
The Responsibility of Superfluous Railroads. Sept. 20.
Prohibition and Prosperity in the West. Nov. 15.
Further Investigations of Western Farm Mortgages. Dec. 15.
Some Well Arranged Statistics of Railways. Dec. 20.
Railway Pools and Trade Unions. Dec. 27.

1891.

Western Legislatures and Western Railroads. Jan. 24.
Local Self-Government as a Failure. May 2.
Professional Philanthropists. May 30.
Public Subsidies to Private Charities. June 27.
Natural Selection and the Slums. July 3.
Municipal Self-Government. July 11.
Cities Made to Order. Aug. 22.
A Severe Test for the Farmers Alliance. Nov. 7.
How Private Property in Land Originates. Nov. 14.
On the Propriety of Emasculating Legislatures. Dec. 5.

1892.

Natural Selection Among States and Cities. March 5.
"A Flurry in the Brain Market." July 9.
Convicts, Demagogues and Doctrinaires. Aug. 27, 1893.
The Expediency of Being Candid. May 27, 1903.
Our Exhibition of Administrative Awkwardness. Oct. 7.